



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,578	06/29/2001	Miklos Sagi	367.40296X00	5598

20457 7590 11/10/2004

ANTONELLI, TERRY, STOUT & KRAUS, LLP
1300 NORTH SEVENTEENTH STREET
SUITE 1800
ARLINGTON, VA 22209-9889

EXAMINER

CHANKONG, DOHM

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2152

DATE MAILED: 11/10/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/893,578

Applicant(s)

SAGI, MIKLOS

Examiner

Dohm Chankong

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) *
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/29/2001.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

- 1> Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2> The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- 3> Claims 1, 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blount et al, U.S Patent No. 6,070,184 ["Blount"] in view of Slotznick, U.S Patent No. 6,011,537.

- 4> As to claim 1, Blount discloses a method of accessing remote data from a portable device [column 1 «lines 6-8»], comprising:

monitoring a user interface of the portable device for the selection of an item of information from a plurality of items of information presented to the user of the portable device on a display, each said item of information being associated with further information stored on a remote computer [column 1 «lines 32-47» where: Blount's hyper-link statements are analogous to a plurality of items of information];

in response to the selection of an item of information from the plurality of items of information, sending a first request to a remote server for said associated information [Figure 5 «item 264»];

waiting for the receipt of said associated information in response to said first request [column 3 «lines 45-56»];

while waiting for the receipt of said associated information, monitoring for a subsequent selection of a further item of information from said plurality of items of information and, in response to a subsequent selection, sending a request for the associated information of said further item of information to a remote server [column 3 «lines 45-56» | column 8 «lines 17-33»].

Blount disclose on receipt of said associated information, presenting to a user an indicator to indicate this receipt and that this indicator [column 15 «lines 16-44»] but does not specifically disclose an indicator comprising the momentary display of the received associated information.

5> Slotznick discloses a momentary display of received associated information [column 26 «lines 5-18» | column 32 «lines 57-65»] for the expressed purpose of giving the client a glimpse of the information that has been received from the server. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Slotznick's data displaying functionality, i.e. predetermined amount of time to display the information to the client, as a notification device in Blount to allow the client a notification and quick glimpse at the

Art Unit: 2152

information downloaded while staying true to Blount's invention of allowing the user to continue working and without being overwhelmed [Blount - column 15 «lines 30-37»].

6> As to claim 3, Blount discloses a method according to claim 1, wherein the information associated with the further request is subsequently presented to the user in response to an input by the user [column 5 «lines 61-63»].

7> As to claim 4, Blount discloses a method according to claim 1, further comprising: receiving associated information and storing the associated information on a memory, forming a list of the selected items of information for which the associated information has been received, displaying the list on the display of the device, monitoring for a selection of an item of information from the list and retrieving the further information associated with the item selected from the list [column 15 «lines 38-63»].

8> As to claims 10 and 13, as they are merely claims to a portable device and browser, respectively, that implement the steps of the method of claim 1, they do not teach or further define over the limitations of claim 1. Therefore claims 10 and 13 are rejected for the same reasons set forth for claim 1, supra.

9> As to claim 11, Blount discloses a portable device according to claim 10, wherein the device is portable telecommunications device [column 2 «lines 13-26»].

10> As to claim 15, Blount discloses a method of accessing remote data from a portable device, comprising:

monitoring a user interface of the portable device for the selection of an item of information from a plurality of items of information presented to the user of the portable device on a display, each said item of information being associated with further information stored on a remote computer [column 1 «lines 32-47» where: Blount's hyper-link statements are analogous to a plurality of items of information];

in response to the selection of an item of information from the plurality of items of information, sending a first request to a remote server for said associated information [Figure 5 «item 264»];

waiting for the receipt of said associated information in response to said first request [column 3 «lines 45-56»];

while waiting for the receipt of said associated information, monitoring for a subsequent selection of a further item of information from said plurality of items of information and, in response to a subsequent selection, sending a request for the associated information of said further item of information to a remote server [column 3 «lines 45-56» | column 8 «lines 17-33»],

receiving associated information and storing the associated information in memory, forming a list of the selected items of information for which the associated information has been received, displaying the list on the display of the device, monitoring for a selection of an item of information from the list and retrieving from memory the further information

Art Unit: 2152

associated with the item selected from the list [column 15 «lines 37-63» | column 16 «lines 19-24»].

11> Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blount and S, in further view of Deo et al, U.S Patent No. 5,973,612 [“Deo”].

12> Blount does not disclose a method wherein an icon is presented on the display together with the plurality of items of information.

13> Deo discloses a method of presenting an icon presented on the display [Figure 3 | column 7 «lines 19-25»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Deo’s icon functionality into Blount’s response notification system to provide a more visual sign that a response has arrived to the client.

14> Claims 5 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blount and , in further view of an Official Notice.

15> As to claim 5, Blount does disclose a list that is ordered but does not explicitly disclose the list is ordered in order of request.

16> Official Notice is taken that performing the action of ordering responses to requests on a list of results is well known and expected in the art. Such a technique helps the client

Art Unit: 2152

better organize the results in a fashion that is more amenable to the client's wishes for viewing the responses to his earlier requests first. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably inferred that Blount would have incorporated such a list ordering technique into his list creation system to increase the flexibility with which the user can view his results.

17> As to claim 6, Blount does disclose a list that is ordered but does not explicitly disclose that the list is ordered in reverse order of request.

18> Official Notice is taken that performing the action of reverse ordering responses to requests on a list of results is well known and expected in the art. Such a technique helps the client better organize the results in a fashion that is more amenable to the client's wishes to see the responses to his latest requests first. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably inferred that Blount would have incorporated such a list reverse ordering technique into his list creation system to increase the flexibility with which the user can view his results.

19> Claims 7-9 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blount and, in further view of Lambert et al, U.S Patent No. 6,038,601 ["Lambert"].

20> As to claim 7, Blount does not disclose a method according to claim 1 wherein on presentation of the plurality of items of information to the user a request is sent to the

Art Unit: 2152

remote server for the associated information for all the items of information presented to the user.

21> Lambert discloses a method according to claim 1 wherein on presentation of the plurality of items of information to the user a request is sent to the remote server for the associated information for all the items of information presented to the user [column 6 «lines 38-39» | column 16 «lines 43-47»] for the expressed purpose of prefetching the associated information for all the items of information presented to the user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Lambert's prefetching functionality into Blount for the obtained advantage of speeding information download to the mobile handheld device, especially useful in the transient world of wirelessness.

22> As to claim 8, Blount does not disclose a method of claim 7, wherein, when a user selects and information from the plurality of items of information, a check is made to ascertain whether the associated information of the selected item has already been received by the portable device and, when the associated information of the selected item has not already been received by the portable device, sending a request to the remote server for the information associated with the selected item.

23> Lambert discloses a method of claim 7, wherein, when a user selects and information from the plurality of items of information, a check is made to ascertain whether the associated information of the selected item has already been received by the portable device

Art Unit: 2152

and, when the associated information of the selected item has not already been received by the portable device, sending a request to the remote server for the information associated with the selected item [column 5 «lines 54-60» | column 6 «lines 43-45»] for the expressed purpose of obtaining the specific content desired and requested by the user. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Lambert's caching and user request priority system into Blount for the obtained advantage of prioritizing user-specified requests as the most important request sent from the client device.

24> As to claim 9, Blount does not disclose canceling the request for the associated information for all of the items of information when a request for the information associated with the selected item is sent.

25> Lambert discloses a method further comprising canceling the request for the associated information for all of the items of information when a request for the information associated with the selected item is sent. [column 16 «lines 66-67» | column 37 «lines 15-37» | column 38 «lines 1-9»]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to further implement Lambert's request priority system into Blount to emphasize user-specified requests in terms of their importance of being serviced by the server. Implementing such a system would allow more efficient use of bandwidth in Blount's network.

26> As to claim 14, Blount discloses a method of accessing remote data, comprising:
monitoring a user interface for the selection of an item of information from a

Art Unit: 2152

plurality of items of information presented to the user on a display, each said item of information being associated with further information stored on a remote server [column 1 «lines 32-47» | column 15 «lines 59-63» where: Blount's hyper-link statements are analogous to a plurality of items of information];

in response to the selection of an item of information from the plurality of items of information, sending a first request to a remote server for said associated information [Figure 5 «item 264»];

on receipt of said associated information in response to said first request displaying the associated information on the display [column 16 «lines 25-29»];

Blount does not explicitly disclose wherein on presentation of the plurality of items of information to the user a request is sent to a remote server or servers for the further information associated with all of the items of information presented.

27> Lambert discloses a method according to claim 1 wherein on presentation of the plurality of items of information to the user a request is sent to the remote server for the associated information for all the items of information presented to the user [column 6 «lines 38-39» | column 16 «lines 43-47»] for the expressed purpose of prefetching the associated information for all the items of information presented to the user. Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate Lambert's prefetching functionality into Blount for the obtained advantage of speeding information download to the mobile handheld device, especially useful in the transient world of wirelessness.

28>

29> Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blount and , in further view of Zarom, U.S Patent No. 6,356,529.

30> Blount discloses utilizing wireless devices but does not specifically disclose that the device is a WAP device.

31> However, the use of the WAP (or wireless access protocol) has become ubiquitous in the wireless arena. For example, Zarom discloses that WAP devices are now the standard, their proliferation due to their efficient transport and transmission of data to handheld wireless devices [column 1 «lines 25-35»]. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would have reasonably inferred that Blount's wireless device would be implemented as a WAP device to take advantage of the many advantages provided by the protocol as disclosed in Zarom.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

U.S Patent No. 5,867,652 to Hurvig et al [abstract – system for supporting a plurality of requests from a client to a server and responding to the requests asynchronously].

Art Unit: 2152

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dohm Chankong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00AM - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DC



Dung C. Dinh
Primary Examiner